

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-80 are pending in the application. Claims 1-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Amendments

Amended independent claims 1 and 16 propose a platform-independent method and system, respectively, for managing node-specific exceptions within network nodes that involves sending node-specific exception data to a network management system sever by a self-service financial transaction terminal coupled to the network management system server regarding at least one node-specific exception event occurring at the terminal, remotely storing and prioritizing the exception data by the network management system sever according to pre-defined node-specific exception event priority parameters, presenting information related to the exception data by the network management system server according to its prioritization to a user who is monitoring the exception data at a client terminal coupled to the network management system server in response to the user's request for the information, and remotely transmitting a corrective response to the node-specific exception event from the user at the client terminal to the self-service financial transaction terminal. See, e.g., Spec., p. 26, line 6-p. 29, line 10; p. 35, line 16-p. 37, line 4.

Claims 37-44, 51-58, and 63-80 are canceled (which renders their rejection moot); and claims 7, 10-14, 22, 25-29, 31-35, 45-49, 59, 60, and 62 are amended to address editorial issues raised by the amendment of claims 1 and 16. Support for the foregoing amendment is found throughout the specification and in the claims and as detailed above. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-80 stand rejected as obvious over Coutts (U.S. 6,311,165) in view of Ditmer (U.S. 6,473,407) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The rejection is respectfully

traversed and reconsideration is requested. The references asserted do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

With regard to amended independent claims 1 and 16, there is no teaching or suggestion in Coutts or Ditmer, either separately or in combination with one another, for example, of sending node-specific exception data to the network management system sever by the self-service financial transaction terminal regarding a node-specific exception event occurring at the terminal or transmitting a corrective response to the node-specific exception event from the user at the client terminal to the self-service financial transaction terminal, as recited in amended claims 1 and 16. On the contrary, Coutts discloses an ATM with typical ATM peripheral devices including a user interface, card reader, receipt printer and cash dispenser which, according to the “thin client” architecture of Coutts, are each linked directly to the central server that holds all the application software for each of the peripheral devices, so while the ATM peripheral applications can be monitored and queried from a client interface at a workstation, the ATM peripherals are directly monitored at the central server which holds the applications software instead of at the ATM. See, e.g., Coutts, Col 3, lines 5-38-Col 4, line 55; Col 11, line 53-Col 12, line 57; Col 16, lines 34-65; Col 33, lines 25-54; Col 34, line 33-Col-Col 35, line 38.

Ditmer fails to remedy the deficiencies of Coutts. On the contrary, instead of managing node-specific exceptions within network nodes, as recited in amended claims 1 and 16, Ditmer discloses a telecommunications network tool that gives alarms on degraded or broken networks, i.e., when a switched network reaches a predefined degraded level or goes out of service altogether, an alarm is generated, so the customer can go to an appropriate alternate routing plan. See, e.g., Ditmer, Col 2, lines 34-39; Col 3, line 40-Col 4, line 5; Col 13, lines 18-25; Col 17, lines 10-45; Col 18, lines 40-55; Col 19, lines 5-15. Thus, the Ditmer tool deals with exclusively with telecommunications routing similar to a trip planning service that reports on how bad traffic conditions and road hazards are on particular routes and recommends alternative routes, and Ditmer teaches or suggests absolutely nothing about network nodes or about managing node-

specific exceptions occurring within network nodes, such as self-service financial transaction terminals, as recited in amended claims 1 and 16.

Consequently, Coutts and/or Ditmer, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to disclose or even suggest, the required combinations of limitations recited in amended claims 1 and 16 proposing a platform-independent method and system, respectively, for managing node-specific exceptions within network nodes that involves sending node-specific exception data to a network management system sever by a self-service financial transaction terminal regarding a node-specific exception event occurring at the terminal, remotely storing and prioritizing the exception data by the network management system sever according to pre-defined node-specific exception event priority parameters, presenting information related to the exception data by the network management system server according to its prioritization to a user at a client terminal in response to the user's request for the information, and remotely transmitting a corrective response to the node-specific exception event from the user at the client terminal to the self-service financial transaction terminal.


Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 16, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. See In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP §2143.03. Similarly, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for claims 2-15 and 31-36 depending on amended claim 1 and claims 17-30, 45-50, and 59-62 depending on amended claim 16, and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence to the references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, each of the claims remaining in the application is in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection and to pass the application to issue. The examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at (336) 607-7318 to discuss any questions relating to the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/18/05


John M. Harrington (Reg. No. 25,592)
for George T. Marcou (Reg. No. 33,014)

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 508-5800